



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**  
**Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/121,528	07/23/98	DERDERIAN	G M4065.069/P0

THOMAS J D'AMICO  
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO  
MORIN & OSHINSKY  
2101 L STREET NW  
WASHINGTON DC 20037-1526

IM22/0307

EXAMINER

MEEKS, T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1762

11

DATE MAILED:

03/07/00

**Pleas find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

**Advisory Action**

Applicati n No.

09/121,528

Examiner

Timothy H. Meeks

Applicant(s)

DERDERIAN, GARO J.

Art Unit

1762

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 29 February 2000 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance or a Notice of Appeal. Alternatively, applicant may obtain further examination by timely filling a request for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d).

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check only a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ In view of the early submission of the proposed reply (within two months as set forth in MPEP § 707.07 (f)), the period for reply expires on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, OR continues to run from the mailing date of the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.


Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136 (a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked.

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will be entered upon the timely submission of a Notice of Appeal and Appeal Brief with requisite fees.
3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter. (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

4. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
5. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
6. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
7. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
8. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claim(s) is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
- Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.
- Claim(s) rejected: 1-4, 6-10, 12-36 and 46-55.
- Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.
9. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ a) ☐ has b) ☐ has not been approved by the Examiner.
10. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
11. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Continuation of 6. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that the references are not properly combined due to differences in the chemistries occurring for deposition and argue specific differences between the references and the claims individually. This is not convincing. The only difference between the claimed invention and Baum is that the claim requires a specified deposition pressure range whereas Baum is silent as to the pressure to use. Obviously, a pressure needs to be used for the deposition so one looking at Baum is left to ascertain which pressure to use. The secondary references exemplify that platinum CVD from similar organometallic precursors occurs at 2 Torr and 760 Torr, thereby suggesting that pressures from 2 to 760 Torr are operable for such CVD. From these teachings, one would clearly expect pressures in the claimed range to be operable and use of such pressures determined by routine experimentation based on the pressures' known effect on variables such as deposition rate, film morphology, etc. for optimization would have been obvious absent evidence showing a criticality for using the claimed pressures.



TIMOTHY MEEKS  
PRIMARY EXAMINER